DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 529 CS 005 399

TITLE Right-to-Read Program, District of Columbia. Evaluation Report, 1978-1779.

INSTITUTION Contemporary Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.; District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Right to Read Program.

PUB DATE [80]

CONTRACT 0428-AA-NS-0-9-GA

NOTE 117p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Program Evaluation; Reading Improvement; Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; *Reading Research

IDENTIFIERS *District of Columbia; *Right to Read

ABSTRACT

The accomplishments of the Right to Read Effort of the District of Columbia Public Schools since its implementation, with specific emphasis on accomplishments during the 1978-79 program year, are documented in this evaluation report. The first part of the report provides a description of the program and of the evaluation design. The report's second part offers an analysis of evaluation findings, evidence of the effectiveness of the program, and conclusions, implications, and recommendations. Appendixes contain copies of the Right to Read standards of excellence, instruments used for the evaluation, the needs assessment instrument for administrators, and lists of members of the District of Columbia Right to Read advisory council and the state task force of Right to Read. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185529

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RIGHT TO READ PROJECT

TARGET FOR THE 70's

EVALUATION REPORT

1978-79
District of Columbia
Public Schools

CA CONTEMPORARY ASSOCIATES, INC.

CS805399

EVALUATION REPORT

1978 - 1979

Right-to-Read Program

District of Columbia

District of Columbia Public Schools
Dr. Vincent Reed, Superintendent

Division of Research and Evaluation
Dr. Mildred Cooper, Associate Superintendent

Research Associate
Ms. Veta Harrison

Grants Administration Branch
Mr. Robert Tarkington

Office of Instructional Program Development and Services
Dr. James Guines, Associate Superintendent

Ms. Mary Harris, State Director
Right-to-Read Program

MAY 16 1980

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work reported herein was performed by Contemporary Associates, Incorporated under Contract No: 0428-AA-NS-0-9-GA with the Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

The report is based on work performed by C. Lawton, Evaluation Director, Researchers Eartha Sanders, and Marie Sutherland of Contemporary Associates, Incorporated.

The results and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the District of Columbia Public Schools and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Recognition is also given to Ms. G. Huggins and B. Bailey for producing and assembling this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	iii
PART I	
INTRODUCTION	1
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	3
EVALUATION DESIGN	26
PART II	
ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION FINDINGS	38
EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS	57
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	70
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A - Standards of Excellence	A-1
APPENDIX B - Instruments Utilized for the Evaluation	B-1
APPENDIX C - Administrators Needs Assessment Instrument Developed by the Right to Read State Office	C-1
APPENDIX D - District of Columbia Right to Read Advisory Council	D-1
APPENDIX E - Right to Read State Task Force	E-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

SECTION		PAGE
TABLE 1	- Percentage of Skills Mastered by 50% or more of Students of Each Test Level by Grade, Fall 1976, Spring 1977.	6
TABLE 2	- Analysis of Right to Read Objectives, Related Activities (Strategies) and Evaluation	8
TABLE 3	- New and Continuing Participants - The Right to Read Leadership Training Program.	25
TABLE 4	- Participating Administrators	26
TABLE 5	- Student Sample form Patticipating Schools. .	27
TABLE 6	- Teacher Sample from Participating Schools. .	27
TABLE 7	- Training Areas Covered on Right to Read - Training Session Agenda for 1978-1979 - Administrators' Training Session	34
TABLE 8	- Analysis of Participating Schools' Development of Long Range Reading Plans. . .	35
TABLE 9	- Identified Areas of Improvement in Teachers' Performance as a Result of Right to Read Activities	37
TABLE 10	- Participating Administrators' Evaluation of Training Seminar.	38
TABLE 11	- Technical Assistance Provided by Right to Read Program	40
TABLE 12	- Student Participation in Right to Read Activities	43
TABLE 13	- Categorization of Volunteer Task Force Meetings, 1979-1979.	47
TABLE 14	- Analysis of Right to Read Objective(s) . . .	49

NOTE: All documents referenced in this report may be obtained from the D. C. State Office of Right to Read.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

SECTION	PAGE
TABLE 15 - Analysis of Task Force Meetings.	56
TABLE 16 - Analysis of Adivsory Council Meetings. . . .	58

PART I

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Right to Read Program of the District of Columbia represents a comprehensive, collaborative effort to assess, document and implement exemplary reading programs within the Public Schools and community to eliminate illiteracy within the District of Columbia.

The Program is a joint effort between schools and community to eliminate illiteracy among the children, youth, and adults of the District of Columbia, and to deliberately engage in activities to serve the current reading needs existing within the District of Columbia.

The effort was funded by the National Office of the Right to Read of the U.S. Office of Education in July, 1975. This initial year was designated as a planning year designed to convene representative groups of all educational organizations as participants in the planning process. The group representatives had the goal of supporting the promotion of active, integrated school-community involvement by assisting in the scheduling of activities to accomplish certain objectives specified in the Right to Read State Planning Program.

The plan formulated as a result of the initial planning year began implementation in the following school year (1976-1977), and has continued implementation consistent with the Standards of Excellence (See Appendix A).

The Standards of Excellence were developed to serve as a guide for program priority setting and implementation strategies for the second year (1976-77); the Delphi Technique of consensus on the Standard of Excellence was initiated and completed. This process resulted in consolidation and clarification of the Standards of Excellence. Thus the previous forty-eight (48) Standards were reduced to twenty (20).

This is the third implementation year (1978-1979) of the Right to Read Program. Since its inception, the Right to Read Program has continued to involve school and community in definition and implementation of activities to serve the reading needs of the children, youth and adults of the District of Columbia.

This evaluation report documents the accomplishments of the Right to Read Effort of the District of Columbia Public Schools since its implementation with specific emphasis on accomplishments during the 1978-1979 program year.

CHAPTER II
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The D.C. Public Schools has received funds under the Right to Read Program since 1975.

The administrative structure of the D.C. Public Schools is unique because of the combined city-state status of the Nation's Capitol. The state and local functions of public education normally found in separate agencies in other states are integrated into one system in the District of Columbia with one superintendent and one board of education. The State education agency, within the Division of Instructional Program Development and Services, also administers the Right to Read Program.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

The Office of the Associate Superintendent, Division of Instructional Services, began the Right to Read Effort in the District of Columbia in July 1975. The program is now operational under the administration of the Division of Instructional Development and Services and the direct supervision of the State Right to Read Director.

Two monitoring and input mechanisms (established during the planning year) facilitate the planning and implementation process: an Advisory Council composed of representatives from the Mayor's Office, City Council, D.C. school administrators, private educational agencies, etc; and, a State Agency Task Force comprised of representatives from all programs within the District of Columbia.

Although the Right to Read Program is a process-oriented effort, specifications of each component of the process is

helpful in delineating the program effort. The Right to Read Director with input from Advisory Council and Task Force carries out the objectives of the program.

An Advisory Council functions to set policies and to assist in the planning effort.

A State Agency Task Force functions to assist in carrying out activities related to meeting the stated objectives.

The staffing structure of the Right to Read Program consists of a State Director of Right to Read, a Secretary and Clerk-Typist.

An Assistant Director and Reading Specialist served the Right to Read Program for part of the program year. Both retired during the year and were not replaced. *

Target Population

The District of Columbia has the fourteenth largest Public School System in the United States, ranking ninth among urban schools. In the 1978-79 school year, the Public Schools of the District of Columbia served approximately 111,532.

During the 1976-76 school year (June 28 - July 1, 1976) the first Right to Read Administrator's Training Seminar was conducted for a total of approximatley 33 administrators from each of the six regions of D. C. Public Schools. In the 1977-78 school year (June 19-23, 1978) approximately 56 new administrators from each of the six regions participated in the Right to Read Administrator's Training Seminar. A conference was held for the previously trained administrators. During 1978-79 47 new administrators were provided training in the Right to Read strategy for implementing reading programs (Aug. 27-29). Forty-four

* These staff were funded by the regular budget of the D. C. Public Schools.

previously trained administrators attended an annual conference from August 29-31 at which time they were provided additional opportunity for increasing their knowledge in the area of reading.

Needs Assessment

This needs assessment is taken from the state Right to Read proposal as submitted to the D. C. Board of Education and the Office of Education, National Right to Read Office.

> The Right to Read Program of the District of Columbia has engaged in efforts to update and structure assessment of reading needs within the schools and community of the District of Columbia. The current and previous years programs have been based on assessment of community needs from secondary data sources and assessment of student needs from primary data sources.
>
> The District of Columbia boasts a population characterized by a diversity without peer in the World today. Having approximately 690,000 residents representing Black, White, American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, Oriental, Pacific Islands, as well as, Hispanic Origins, Washington is aptly described as the crossroads of the world.
>
> Nearly fifteen percent of the youth and adult population of the District of Columbia has an educational attainment of grades 0-8, according to the 1970 census. An additional fifteen percent entered but failed to complete high school....*
>
> The children in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia have scored at or above grade level on the California Achievement Test at the primary level since Spring, 1975....**
>
> The Prescriptive Reading Test (criterion referenced), was developed jointly by the D. C. Public School System and a test company. The percent of reading skills mastery by students in grades 1 through 9 on the Prescriptive Reading Tests indicate significant gains in demonstrated mastery of objectives in reading between the Fall and Spring test 1976-77 at all levels (See Table 1).

* Source: Right to Read State Leadership Training Proposal, Public Schools of the District of Columbia 1977-78.

** Source: Data Resource Book, Public Schools of the District of Columbia, 1974-75, 75-76, 76-77, 77-78.

TABLE 1

Percentage of Skills Mastered by 50% or more of Students of Each Test Level by Grade

Fall 1976, Spring 1977
Prescriptive Reading Test

Test Level and Number of Skills	Grade	Number Fall	Number Spring	Percent Fall	Percent Spring
A-21 Skills	1	14	18	67	86
B-45 Skills	2	26	40	58	89
C-39 Skills	3	31	35	79	90
D-37 Skills	4	23	28	62	76
E-37 Skills	5	28	30	76	81
G-37 Skills	6	24	26	77	81
H-36 Skills	7	23	25	64	69
H-36 Skills	8	22	24	61	67
H-36 Skills	9	24	25	67	69

There were, however, several areas - syllables/numbers, consonant diagraphs, word endings, inference, literal meaning, author's purpose, figurative language, and using books-in which fewer than fifty percent of the students demonstrated mastery.

An evaluation of reading conducted by the Division of Research and Evaluation in forty-four elementary schools reveals that: *

1. 64% of the elementary school students have either slight or no interest in reading.

2. 64% of the students infrequently or never read on their own.

3. Nearly 60% of the students need some degree of extra reading help.

4. Only 25% of those students who receive help, receive it on a daily basis.

5. 54% of the elementary school students have no source of extra help.

6. In 38% of the cases, a lack of tutors was cited as the major reason for not having additional help.

* Source: Right to Read State Leadership Training Proposal Public Schools of the District of Columbia, 1977-78.

7. Overall, 64% of the students cannot be considered to be interested, independent readers despite the fact that the curriculum materials being used are deemed to be effective and suitable.

Development of Program Objectives:

The Right to Read Office of the District of Columbia continually engages in needs assessment activities which identify students' reading deficiencies and administrators' and teachers' needs for training which will help them more effectively meet students' needs in the reading areas. As a result of this needs assessment process, the Right to Read Effort is able to document and prioritize specific objectives for each year.

The objectives of the Right to Read Effort have been directed in the initial year specifically to planning and in the three subsequent years to program clarification and implementation.

The planning phase was designed to convene representative groups of all educational, governmental and community organizations as participants in the planning process with the goal of supporting the promotion of active, integrated school-community involvement through scheduling of a variety of planned activities for group representatives to accomplish specific objectives of the Right to Read State Planning Program.

The second, third and fourth program years have focused on specific objectives related to plans formulated during the initial year.

The goals and objectives as stated in the FY '78-79 proposal are given here with the corresponding activities and documentation specified for each. Table 2 presents an analysis of the Right to Read Effort's objectives for the 1978-79 school year. In addition, the Table 2 indicates the activities planned to help achieve each objective.

TABLE 2

RIGHT TO READ OBJECTIVES
RELATED ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES) AND EVALUATION 1/

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES)	EVALUATION (DOCUMENTATION)
1. Based upon the 20 criterion on which constitute the proposed Standards of Excellence, the State Right to Read Staff will conduct a comprehensive statewide "pyramidal" needs assessment of reading in D.C.		
a. Identify the reading achievement of students.	Right to Read staff will identify and publicize the objectives on which students show unsatisfactory attainment and incorporate strategies into the Right to Read training program for local administrators to assist teachers in helping students and to better coordinate the resources of the State Assessment Program with the reading resources (personnel) at the local level.	Test summary will be completed and disseminated in June, 1979 for Fall test scores. Summary report for objectives with unsatisfactory attainment and recommendations for improvement in administrative and teaching techniques are reproduced and disseminated in June, 1979.
b. Identify target population of students with reading needs.	Right to Read staff will analyze the State Assessment data to identify and prioritize areas where the reading achievement is lowest and initiate special recruitment in these areas for participation in the training program.	Listings of areas, schools and personnel and needs summarized from achievement data.

1/Source: Right to Read State Leadership Training Proposal, Public Schools of the District of Columbia 1977-78

TABLE 2

RIGHT TO READ OBJECTIVES
RELATED ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES) AND EVALUATION (Cont'd.)

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES)	EVALUATION (DOCUMENTATION)
c. Identify the local districts that have not yet participated in the Administrators Training Program.	Right to Read staff will identify 200 local administrators who have not yet participated in the training and recruit their participation in the training program.	Written communication to regions, local schools, and non-profit private schools, and other educational agencies by October 1, 1978.
d. Assess the personnel needs for in-service and other leadership activities.	Right to Read staff will analyze data from state needs assessment of staff development, consult with regional directors and assist them in the conduct of local surveys to determine the in-service needs of personnel.	Summaries of in-service needs of participants trained during the previous years of the Right to Read effort in the District of Columbia by October 15, 1978.
e. Assess needs relative to the appropriateness and opportunities in reading for pre-service and in-service training and certification of teachers, administrators and other educational personnel.	Right to Read staff has initiated a "Communiversity" Forum to respond to this objective. Public Law 93-407, Section 204 effective 1976 mandates recertification every five years for all Teacher Salary Act - 15 employees of the District of Columbia, beginning 1980. The "Communiversity" Forum is the mechanism through which recommendations may be made to the Superintendent regarding self-assessment instruments to facilitate wise judgments in the selection of courses to fulfill the recertification. The "Communiversity" Forum can also facilitate the availability and influence the appropriateness of courses for teachers. The Right to Read staff will publish and disseminate this information among the	Communiversity Forum agendas, minute reports.

TABLE 2

RIGHT TO READ OBJECTIVES
RELATED ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES) AND EVALUATION (cont'd.)

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES)	EVALUATION (DOCUMENTATION)
	7,000 TSA-15 employees. Establishment of new certification is projected. Activities are to be in progress at monthly meetings of the "Communiversity" Forum. Completion and modified offerings at the area universities is projected to be completed by August, 1979.	
f. Produce a needs assessment document.	Compile the various reports of the needs assessment. Summarize and edit the assessment reports relative to: a. reading achievement b. special target populations c. local education agencies d. administrative personnel	Written needs assessment report due to be completed in June, 1979.
g. Provide for periodic updating of needs assessment data.	Right to Read staff will analyze and disseminate reading achievement data each year as the annual report is available from the Department of Pupil Appraisal and data are collected regarding student achievement, programmatic functions as personnel needs.	Written updated Needs Assessment Reports by June 20, 1979.
2. Given a cadre of committed administrators, the State Right to Read Effort will provide training experiences covering a minimum of 60 hours of activity per participant.		

TABLE 2

RIGHT TO READ OBJECTIVES
RELATED ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES) AND EVALUATION (cont'd.)

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES)	EVALUATION (DOCUMENTATIONS)
a. The training program will be based on the in-service needs assessment conducted by the Right to Read on the Standards of Excellence for Reading.	Right to Read staff will develop the training program based on the in-service needs assessment collected from regional Right to Read Directors and training participants through interviews and end-of-training reports.	Agenda and Specifications for Administrators Training completed by November 1, 1978.
b. The Right to Read staff will conduct training programs for public and private non-profit local education agency reading administrators.	The Right to Read staff will plan and implement the 24 day training program, to be held in eight 3 day segments (one 3 day segment per month). It is projected that 84 local education agencies will participate in the training (42 in FY '78 and 42 in FY'79), in addition to the participants of FY'76 and '77, the State Right to Read will pay minimal travel, food and lodging expenses for six regions. The regions will be encouraged to send three per region at their own expense. Reading administrators from private non-private educational agencies will be invited to participate. Moreover, adult reading educators from each local education agency will participate in the training.	

TABLE 2

RIGHT TO READ OBJECTIVES
RELATED ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES) AND EVALUATION (Cont'd.)

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES)	EVALUATION (DOCUMENTATIONS)
	The Right to Read Office will enter into a negotiated service contract with local unit and/or with individuals to help with the implementation of the training. The Right to Read staff will obtain university credit for participants in the training program at their individual option and expense. Note: The D.C. area universities have a consortium relationship which can expedite enrollment procedures. Arrangements will be sought to approve the Right to Read training for up to nine semester hours of credit among consortium members - Catholic University, American University, Howard University, George Washington University, University of the District of Columbia.	

TABLE 2
RIGHT TO READ OBJECTIVES
RELATED ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES) AND EVALUATION (Cont'd.)

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES)	EVALUATION (DOCUMENTATION)
c. The training program will include knowledge in the areas of reading, program management, and change agent skills.	The training program will provide training experiences in the following areas: a. Teaching of Basic Reading Skills b. Organization and Administration Skills c. Interpersonal Relations Skills Directed Toward Community Involvement and the Change Process d. Planning Strategies e. Administrative Support Materials for Reading Program f. Identification and Use of Resources g. Appropriate Bilingual Methods for Children and Adults of Limited English Speaking Ability h. Approaches to the Provision of Effective Reading Instruction to the Various Target Populations, Including the Planning and Evaluation of Programs for Adults	The product for each participant in the training program is long range comprehensive plan for his/her local education agency based on the agency's needs to eliminate illiteracy.
3. Given a mandate to provide technical assistance related to the development, organization and administration of reading programs, the State Right to Read Staff will:		

TABLE 2

RIGHT TO READ OBJECTIVES
RELATED ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES) AND EVALUATION (Cont'd.)

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES)	EVALUATION (DOCUMENTATION)
• respond to request for follow-up training assistance within 3 days. • provide ongoing assistance		
a. The Right to Read staff will provide follow-up assistance to training participants.	For the past two years, the Right to Read has provided a comprehensive training program for approximately 50 local reading directors who were committed to design and implement a reading program based upon the Right to Read strategy. The Right to Read staff proposes to invite the local educational agencies previously involved in the training to enter into a new agreement with the State Right to Read Office to participate in any number of a series of technical assistance sessions conducted in each of the six regions. During the Sessions, the local administrators will reassess the local plan mindful of present needs with the help of resource people present at the session. The local participants will identify components of the training program for which they need review and additional practice. The revised plans will provide for more effective strategies for achieving the components of a quality reading program as specified in the Standards of Excellence for Reading. The local directors will identify local school task forces to participate in the development and revision of the plan.	Comprehensive leadership development training packages consisting of tested training modules for training local administrators based on assessed competency needs. Revised local plans for reading program improvement.

TABLE 2

RIGHT TO READ OBJECTIVES
RELATED ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES) AND EVALUATION (Cont'd.)

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES)	EVALUATION (DOCUMENTATION)
	The teams will participate in one of the three day sessions. Those administrators who have participated in the initial orientation sessions will be provided additional training to render them capable of serving as regional trainers. Principals initiated partnerships in the 3-day orientation session to facilitate experience sharing between administrators, among teachers and classes. Building on the program efforts of this fiscal year, we are proposing a program effort which would: 1. identify core competencies for the successful administration of a Right to Read program at the local level; 2. develop training packages which provide the competencies, and are individualized; 3. test the modules in at least three training sessions; 4. install the modules training packages as the procedural leadership training in the program.	
4. Given the need to inform and involve all segments of the schools and community, the Right to Read staff will utilize a variety of media and strategies to maximize impact.		

TABLE 2
RIGHT TO READ OBJECTIVES
RELATED ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES) AND EVALUATION (Cont'd.)

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES)	EVALUATION (DOCUMENTATION)
a. Establish criteria for validating reading program.	The Right to Read State Agency Task Force will work with the State committee on validation for ESEA Title III and ESEA Title I to develop and disseminate validation process for reading programs.	Publication of procedure and existing programs to be completed by December 1, 1979.
b. The Right to Read staff will provide dissemination of innovative approaches and exemplary practices by conducting a statewide Right to Read Conference.	The Right to Read staff will plan and implement a state-wide 3 day conference for reading administrators, teachers, students and communities in the District of Columbia. The past and present training participants will be invited to the entire conference, and an invitation will be extended to other reading administrators for one day of the conference.	Conference agenda, list of participants, and evaluation data.
c. The Right to Read will disseminate Right to Read materials made available through USOE and the State Office.	The Right to Read staff will disseminate all documents and information concerning the District of Columbia Right to Read effort to D.C. Schools and community and to all State Directors. Among these documents are: 1. Standards of Excellence 2. Volunteer Training Handbooks 3. IRA - Right to Read Newsletter 4. D.C. Right to Read Express 5. Needs Assessment Document 6. Planning Assessment Handbook 7. Right to Read Movie	Records of materials disseminated.

TABLE 2

RIGHT TO READ OBJECTIVES
RELATED ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES) AND EVALUATION (Cont'd.)

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES (STRATEGIES)	EVALUATION (DOCUMENTATION)
d. The D.C Right to Read will provide for publicizing the high priority of reading.	The D.C. Right to Read staff will provide the dissemination of materials and strategies related to establishing and publicizing the high priority of reading. The activities include: 1. Office of Communication press releases on Right to Read activities; 2. Plan and implement activities around theme of "1979-The International Year of the Child"; 3. Public Service Announcement; 4. Bumper Stickers; 5. Right to Read Mascot; 6. Quarterly Newsletter to local reading directors.	Records and copies of materials disseminated.
e. Initiate broader community participation through the coordination of efforts, involving the private sector.	The Right to Read staff will make a concentrated effort to engage the private sector in the mission of improving reading and giving the community to understand its responsibility in the importance of a coordinated approach.	Records of involvement, meeting minutes, products created.
f. Initiate broader community participation through soliciting and referring volunteers.	The Right to Read staff solicits, trains, and refers volunteers to agencies offering reading seminars.	Year long calendar of procedures and activities on a schedule for annual implementation completed by January, 1979.

Description of Schools Administered by Right to Read Leadership Training Participants

An analysis of the schools of adminstrators who have participated in the Right to Read training shows some unique facts. An analysis of the Right to Read participating schools as they function as a part of the total school system reveals the following:

> The Right to Read Program has trained administrators in a total of 64 schools, including 43 elementary schools, or approximately 34% of 128 total elementary schools in D. C. schools; 13 junior high schools, or 45% of 29 junior high schools; and 8 of 12 senior high schools, or 75% of all senior high schools. Ten (10) of the Right to Read participating schools are involved in the Competency Based Curriculum as pilot schools, while six (6) are Competency Based Curriculum prototype schools. Competency Based Curriculum schools are those schools in which the Competency Based Curriculum of the D. C. Public Schools is being implemented. Thirty-seven (37) of the Right to Read participating schools are Title I Schools. A total of approximately 41,500 students were enrolled in these schools in the 1978-79 school year.*

Right to Read Exemplary Reading Programs

One major thrust of the Right to Read Program has been identifying, supporting and testing exemplary reading programs that have proven their effectiveness on populations similar to those served by the District of Columbia.

In support of this, the Right to Read Program serves as a clearinghouse for reviewing and making recommendations for various

* Reference: Data Resource Book, Public Schools of the District of Columbia, 1977-78 and 1978-79.

reading materials and projects.

The Right to Read Program has implemented several activities for fostering, implementing and supporting exemplary projects. Two are discussed here:

1. Exemplary Project: Reading Enrichment/Achievement Demonstration Project

The Reading Enrichment/Achievement Demonstration (R.E.A.D.) Project employs the Weiss Phonic-Linguistic Method to improve the reading skills and performance of students attending Adams, Bancroft, H.D. Cooke, Marie H. Reed and Oyster Elementary Schools of the District of Columbia Public Schools. This cluster of schools serves a student population which resides in a geographic area designated as the "multicultural mecca" of the District of Columbia.

The R.E.A.D. schools have a large Spanish-speaking student population, as well as a large black student population, and serve a community that is widely diverse in nationality, income and occupation, representing 35 nationalities and 17 native languages.

The Reading Enrichment/Achievement Demonstration Project is designed to overcome the reading deficiencies of the population of the target schools by using the Weiss Method to develop and strengthen the students' proficiency in the following cognitive domains: work attack skills (including phonetic analysis and structural analysis); vocabulary comprehension and general analytical ability; mode of expression (including snytax and other components of grammar); and language arts skills (including creative writing and visual literacy activities). In the affective domain the project is designed: (a) to facilitate learning, so each student will be better able to fulfill his/her personal goals and his/her obligations to the society in which he/she lives; and (b) to promote social interaction and improve human relationships among people with different cultural backgrounds.

2. Exemplary Project: Success in Reading and Writing.

The Success in Reading and Writing Project was initiated when the Washington Post contacted the D.C. Public Schools expressing an interest in working with the Public Schools in a newspaper reading project. A model of the project existed in Durham,

North Carolina, where D. C. Public School personnel observed the project in action. Region V of the D.C. Public Schools, as a result of reading needs assessment, was identified as a pilot area for the project. The Project was implemented in the following schools in Region V:

Bruce-Monroe	Garrison
Cleveland	Harrison
Clark	Lewis

Eighteen teachers in these schools in Grades 1, 2 and 3 were identified to implement the Project. The Success in Reading and Writing Project has the following objectives:*

By the end of the year, the students will be:

1) reading in the cognitive areas
2) writing in the cognitive areas
3) will have positive self-concept in the affective areas.

First Grade

By the end of the year, every first grader will have read or tried to read 300 library books:

- many different kinds of primary level texts
- a newspaper daily
- information in a variety of catalogs, printed forms, labels, boxes, etc.
- different information in a variety of magazines
- variety of comic books.

By the end of the year, every first grader will have:

- written many different kinds of stories
- written forms, memos, poems, letters, lists, and other forms of written communications.

Second and Third Grade

By the end of the second and third grade, each student will have the opportunity to read:

---

* Sources: Anne H. Adams and Helen Cappleman, Success in Reading and Writing: Grade 2 and Grade 3, (Santa Monica, California: Good Year Publishing Company, Inc. 1978)

Anne H. Adams, Success in Beginning Reading and Writing: The Basic Concept of the Future, (Santa Monica, California: Good Year Publishing Company, Inc., 1978)

1) 350 library books
2) the newspaper daily
3) current magazines
4) science, social studies, math and music textbooks published for different grade levels
5) pamphlets, catalogs, maps, etc.
6) works of art.

By the end of the second and third grade, each student will have had the opportunity to write:

1) daily creative writing
2) daily factual writing related to academic content information
3) a variety of writing skills with emphasis on words, phases, paragraphs and stories containing vocabulary from students in the class.

CHAPTER III
EVALUATION DESIGN

The District of Columbia through the Right to Read Program is making strides in the elimination of illiteracy among its children, youth, and adults. During the last four years, representatives from all segments of the population have organized to give more support to reading instruction. The D.C. Right to Read Program has provided significant leadership and training activities for local administrators whose programs offer reading instruction.

The Program has had both process (formative) and product (summative) evaluations during various stages of its development. The initial planning year had process and product evaluation. The second and third implementation years had process and product evaluation. This effort is an outside summative evaluation of the third implementation year-fourth year of operation.

The results of formative data (in-house) and summative data are reported in Chapter IV of this report.

The major purpose of this evaluation is to measure the extent to which the objectives of the Right to Read Effort have been implemented and accomplished. Nevertheless, education researchers have come to realize that evaluation simply for evaluation sake serves little or no purpose. Evidence has shown that the usefulness of an evaluation is increased when both the evaluator and those being evaluated are interested in the total process. The total process in this instance refers to the causal relationship or a practical explanation of how(s) and why(s) related to the findings of an evaluation.

The evaluator and client have collaborated on every aspect of this evaluation effort. The first design conference was held on April 6, 1979, at the Office of the Division of Research and Evaluation. The conference was attended by a representative of the Division of Research and Evaluation and the Director of the Right to Read State Office. A thorough review of the program activities and previous evaluation was made, a major concern being documentation and accomplishments for the program implementation years.

Other major concerns discussed were:

- Comprehensive needs assessment.
- Revised Standards of Excellence
- Project management and response to needs.
- Overall impact of Right to Read Program.
- Evaluation of Specific Right to Read activities (e.g., Administrators Training Conference, Activities of Advisory Council and Task Force, progress toward accomplishment of Standards of Excellence).
- Cost effectiveness of staff/program.
- Extent to which Program meets federal mandate.

The major consensus was that the evaluation design should be structured to determine which of the Right to Read Program objectives have been met; which need to be addressed as priority; and the cumulative effects of the Program.

Research Design

Several collaborative design conferences were held between the State Office representatives, the Division of Research and Evaluation representatives, the Right to Read staff and the evaluators.

Because this is the third implementation year of the Right to Read Effort and because of the lateness in evaluation contract award, a comprehensive summative review of Program processes and accomplishments was required.

The collaboration and close coordination of the Right to Read Office, representatives of the Division of Research and Evaluation and the evaluators resulted in clear indication that this evaluation year was a most crucial one in determining program direction as well as evaluation design strategies to be employed in the future. All agreed that the maximum expectation was to get specific information on how much the Right to Read Program has accomplished and what its major direction and emphasis should be for the future.

The evaluation design evolved to measure several specific program areas identified as major program emphasis:

- Administrators Training Program
  1. Who participated?
  2. What did participants do with what they learned?
- Right to Read Sponsored Activities
  1. Right to Read - International Year of the Child Activities
  2. Volunteer Tutoring Program
  3. Clearinghouse for Volunteers
  4. Technical Assistance
- Right to Read Program Operation
  1. Staff
  2. Task Force
  3. Advisory Council
  4. Volunteer Task Force
  5. Communiversity Committee

Sampling Plan and Procedures:

At the inception of evaluation, all school system's administrators who had participated in the Right to Read training seminar in 1976 and 1978 were identified. Since this activity constituted the major thrust of the Right to Read Effort, several major questions had to be answered before proceeding with this evaluation, namely:

1. What should be measured related to administrators? What were they trained to do? How had they utilized the competencies acquired as a result of the training?
2. Who and where were the administrators who were trained?

Conferences were held with the Right to Read Program Director and staff to develop a sampling plan adequate to collect the necessary data for program evaluation. As a result, the lists of participating administrators in the previous training seminars were updated. This activity revealed some interesting facts; for the 1975-76 and the 1977-78 school years many of the original persons trained were no longer with the school system; some were not in the same administrative positions as when they participated in the training; and many had changed assignments. Table 3 shows training participants by year.

TABLE 3

NEW AND CONTINUING PARTICIPANTS
THE RIGHT TO READ LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

Training Date(s)	Training Participants New	Continuing
1976	33	
1978	56	33
1979	47	44

As a result of these facts a representative sample of each group of participating administrators was drawn. The sample comprised only those administrators who were at their same placements as when they were trained. Several specific factors were measured in each sample setting. Sample schools were selected from the list of administrators participating in the 1976 and 1978 training seminars.

The administrators at these sample schools are shown by school level in Table 4.

TABLE 4

NUMER OF ADMINISTRATORS PARTICIPATING IN RIGHT TO READ LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM IN STUDY SAMPLE BY SCHOOL LEVEL

School Level	Sample
Senior High	2
Junior High	4
Elementary	6
Total	12

Table 5 shows the sample of students in participating schools responding to the student questionnaire. The sample of students were drawn from those classes designated by the participating administrators as those most actively participating in the Right to Read activities. These students were administered the student questionnaire by the members of the CAI evaluation team.

TABLE 5

STUDENT SAMPLE FROM SCHOOLS OF ADMINISTRATORS PARTICIPATING IN LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

Grade Levels	Sample
12	7
11	24
10	46
9	48
8	22
7	79
6	126
5	1
4	7
3	111
2	12
1	134
Kgn.	2
No grade designation	11
Total	630

Table 6 shows the sample of teachers in participating schools responding to the teacher questionnaire.

TABLE 6

TEACHER SAMPLE FROM SCHOOLS OF ADMINISTRATORS PARTICIPATING IN LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

Level	Sample
Senior High	4
Junior High	8
Elementary	18
Total	30

Instrumentation:

The effectiveness of an evaluation is dependent upon the quality of the instrumentation utilized to collect data. All

instruments utilized in this evaluation were developed by the evaluation team, with the approval of the Division of Research and Evaluation and Right to Read Director (See Appendix B).

- Participating Administrator Questionnaire
- Teacher Questionnaire
- Student Questionnaire
- Staff Interview Instrument
- Task Force Questionnaire
- Advisory Council Questionnaire
- Volunteer Agency Instrument

Each of the instruments, its content and procedures utilized in its administration is discussed here.

Participating Administrator Questionnaire is designed to collect information from those administrators who participated in the 1976 and the 1978 Right to Read Training Seminar regarding their sanction of participating, what they learned as a result of participation, how they used their learnings in the school settings in which they serve, and their plans for continuing to use their skills to improve reading achievement in their school.

Teacher Questionnaire is designed to measure the extent to which teachers are aware of and have participated in specific activities to improve reading in their school sponsored by their administrator, or the Right to Read Program. The teachers given the questionnaire are

teachers in schools of participating administrators.

Student Questionnaire is designed to measure students participation in specific reading activities sponsored by their teacher, school, or the Right to Read Program. The instrument was only administered to students in schools of participating administrators.

Staff Interview Instrument is designed to collect information on specific program activities which have been implemented for change to improve Program performance. All Right to Read Project staff are administered this instrument.

Task Force Questionnaire is designed to measure participation of Task Force members in various activities related to the Right to Read Program and to get some idea of their level of commitment based on participation. These were administered to Task Force members at their meeting of May 11, 1979.

Advisory Council Questionnaire is designed to measure the participation of Advisory Council members, their perception of the group's effectiveness and their level of commitment to the Right to Read Program. These were administered to the Advisory Council. Instruments were mailed to Advisory Council members.

Volunteer Agency Instrument is designed to determine the extent to which clearinghouse and other activities have involved them with the Right to Read Program. A sample of

the agencies to whom most referrals were made and technical coordination given by the Right to Read Program were mailed a questionnaire.

The next section of this report gives the results of all evaluation activities, findings and recommendations made as a result of this evaluation.

PART II

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION FINDINGS

As stated in previous sections of this report, the major purpose of this evaluation effort is to determine the extent to which the Right to Read Program has implemented and accomplished its stated objectives.

The major constraint affecting evaluation findings was the lateness in funding of the evaluation contract, coupled with a teachers' strike during the school year. Attempts were made by program personnel to minimize the effect of these constraints on program performance. In order to present evaluation results in a systematic manner to vividly show program accomplishments, the format for this section of the report will be: the statement of each Right to Read objective, and, delineation of the specific findings related to each. The evaluator feels that this format will serve several important purposes:

1. Each objective of the Right to Read Program will be shown with the corresponding data to indicate the extent of its accomplishment.

2. Specific areas where improvement in program performance are required to accomplish each objective will be specified.

Objective 1: BASED UPON THE 20 CRITERION WHICH CONSTITUTE THE PROPOSED STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE, THE STATE RIGHT TO READ STAFF WILL CONDUCT A COMPREHENSIVE STATEWIDE "PYRAMIDAL" NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF READING IN D.C.

Findings:

a. Results of the Staff Interview Questionnaire indicate that the Pupil Appraisal Division reviews, collects, and organizes the results of the Prescriptive Reading

(Objective 1 continued)

Test and the CTBS in a format suitable for use by the Right to Read Project. These results were translated in usable format to give a profile of the reading needs of the total school system, as shown in the Needs Assessment section of this report (see page 5).

The Right to Read Office also worked with participating administrators to provide them technical assistance in interpreting and using reading test results. Profiles of reading needs of individual regions, schools and classrooms are prepared by all D.C. school administrators.

b. Responses on the staff interview instrument indicate that "a needs assessment was sent out to the schools in 1979 and that another needs assessment was done." Other responses indicated that needs assessment has been conducted by principals; and, that analysis of PRT, CTBS and Everyday Skills Test are used; also, that an evaluation system has been instituted by the Division of Research and Evaluation.

c. Letters of invitation to participate in the administrators' training were sent to regions, local schools and non-profit, private schools and other educational agencies.

d. Results of the Staff Interview Instrument showed that the needs assessment instrument developed in 1977-78 and utilized for assessment of administrators' needs in order to structure the training seminar was utilized to select training participants this year (see Appendix C). Results of this instrument will be utilized for continual assessment for administrators' training sessions (see Appendix C). The results were utilized to discuss who should be involved in training and to structure specific content areas to be covered in the training session.

e. Program data; the results of the Technical Assistance and Work Logs provided by the State Director, and, minutes of Communiversity meetings indicate that the Board of Examiners for Certification in D.C. Public Schools, and, university personnel, have developed and reviewed certification standards for reading.

f. Reading achievement data has been obtained from the Pupil Appraisal Department and has been analyzed by the Right to Read State Office to show areas of needs. The post-test data for 1978-79 was not available to the Right to Read State Office until August 1979. The State Office has reviewed this data and is in the process of preparing a revision subsequent to the latest update of needs assessment which was done in February of 1979 by the Right to Read State Office.

Objective 2: GIVEN A CADRE OF COMMITTED ADMINISTRATORS, THE STATE RIGHT TO READ EFFORT WILL PROVIDE TRAINING EXPERIENCES COVERING A MINIMUM OF 60 HOURS OF ACTIVITY PER PARTICIPANT.

Findings:

a. The Right to Read staff developed and disseminated the training assessment instrument as shown in Appendix E, to all administrators who had not participated in leadership training. As a result participants were selected for the 1978-79 training session.

b. Training session for administrators were conducted as shown in Table 3.

- o A two and one-half day Annual Conference for Right to Read Administrators was held August 29-31, 1979. Forty-four of the previously trained administrators were in attendance, as well as, the newly trained administrators.

- o The Right to Read staff conducted and assisted with several training sessions at the local school level and provided comprehensive technical assistance as shown on Technical Assistance Logs provided by the Right to Read Program Director. The activities and training sessions conducted were based on assessed needs. Also, the constraints of a teachers' strike and the severe winter precluded scheduling some activities related to this objective.

c. The agenda of training for the 1978-79 program year showed that of the 8 areas specified for training content were covered as shown in Table 7.

A total of, approximately, 30 hours of training was offered, however, no administrator participated in a minimum of 60 hours of activity.

Training participants indicated on the Administrators' Questionnaire that long-range plans have been formulated as shown in Table 8.

(Objective 2 continued)

TABLE 7

TRAINING AREAS COVERED ON RIGHT TO READ
TRAINING SESSION AGENDA FOR 1978-79
ADMINISTRATORS' TRAINING SESSION

Area(s) of Training	Agenda Coverage 1978-79 Approximate number of hours
1. Teaching of Basic Reading Skills	3.75 hrs.
2. Organization and Adminstration Skills	5.50 hrs.
3. Interpersonal Relation Skills Directed Toward Community Involvement and the Charge Process	1.00 hr.
4. Planning Strategies	3.00 hrs.
5. Administrative Support Materials for Reading Program	1.00 hr.
6. Identification and Use of Resources	2.00 hrs.
7. Appropriate Bilingual Methods for Children and Adults of Limited English Speaking Ability	1.00 hr.
8. Approaches to the Provision of Effective Reading Instruction to the Various Target Populations, Including the Planning and Evaluation of Programs for Adults	10.25 hrs.
Total hours (1978-79)	27.50 hrs.

(Objective 2 continued)

TABLE 8

STATUS OF DEVELOPMENT OF LONG RANGE READING PLANS AS AS INDICATED BY SAMPLE OF ADMINISTRATORS' PARTICIPATING IN RIGHT TO READ LEADERSHIP TRAINING *

Response	Number	Percent of Sampled Schools
Has been developed	6	50%
Is being planned	3	25%
Will be planned	0	0%
Will be completed	1	8%
No response	2	16%
TOTALS	12	100%

*COMMENTS: Most of those administrators indicating that plans have been developed, also, indicate that they are being implemented. The one indicating that plan will be completed, indicated a completion date of 7-1-79. Sample represents 12 of the participating schools only.

Results on Participating Administrators Questionnaire, also, indicate that each has implemented specific follow-up training. Most of the follow-up training activities focused on raising competency levels of teachers for assessing and diagnosing students' reading needs.

Of the Participating Administrators several indicate that they have established a reading task force. Administrators indicated several other specific activities which they have implemented as a result of participation in the administrative training including needs assessment, etc.

(Objective 2 continued)

In response to the question "What changes in Teachers' performance are discernible as a result of the overall changes in reading programs?", administrators identified four main areas of changes: 1) a better understanding of needs assessment; 2) greater competency at diagnosing reading needs; 3) greater levels of skills in use of teaching techniques and methodologies; and 4) closer communication between parents and teachers in planning students needs (See Table 9).

Completed by administrators in attendance at the Right to Read training session results on evaluation forms designed by the Right to Read staff showed that administrators who have taken part in training felt that the training program has been helpful in assisting them as shown in Table 10.

On August 27-29, 1979, previously trained administrators noted that there were several areas needing improvement to make the Right To Read training program more effective. These were: a) the administrator's training program; and b) the provision of technical assistance to schools. Administrators indicated that while many aspects of the Right to Read Program are satisfactory, there is the need for greater and more intensive training sessions for Administrators. Administrators indicated that the provision of technical assistance to schools should increase beyond the current level of aid and assistance given. Some suggestions made were applicable to the Right to Read Program Effort while

(Objective 2 continued)

others were more appropriate to the total school system. These are presented here:

TABLE 9

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT IN TEACHERS' PERFORMANCES AS A RESULT OF RIGHT TO READ ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED BY ADMINISTRATORS IN 12 SAMPLE SCHOOLS

	Elementary	Jr. High	Sr. High
Teachers have a better understanding of needs assessment and its importance to teach reading.	4	3	2
Teachers be more competent at diagnosing reading needs of students.	3	4	1
Teachers have gained more skills in use of teaching techniques and methodologies that more appropriately meet certain student reading needs.	4	4	
Parents and teachers work more closely in planning students' education needs.	2	1	1
	N=6	N=4	N=2

(Objective 2 continued)

TABLE 10

EVALUATION OF RIGHT TO READ LEADERSHIP TRAINING SESSION BY ADMINISTRATORS PREVIOUSLY TRAINED 1976, 78 and 79 N=44

Response	Number	Percent of all Responses
Helped me to gain more competence to design and implement an effective reading program based on needs.	8	36.4%
Assisted me in defining procedures for assessing student needs.	4	18.2%
Assisted me in defining procedures for assessing teacher and staff development needs.	8	36.4%
No response.	1	4.5%
Other	1	4.5%
Assisted with ideas to develop positive building-wide attitudes towards reading programs.		
TOTAL RESPONSES	22	100.0%

Right to Read Program Suggestions:

Should have at least a one week workshop of intensive training.

The program held in Summer of 1978 should be continued.

Larger Right to Read Program.

System Wide Suggestions:

Greater availability of materials to be used at the local school level.

Resource persons should be available to offer assistance to principals and teachers during the academic year.

More training of administrators is required.

There should be more opportunities for administrators to meet during the school year in "quiet places".

(Objective 2 continued)

Should have more training programs for administrators.

Provide more assistance to teachers who are in greater need.

More face to face contact with instructors, especially new instructors.

Should visit schools early in the school year to assess and provide assistance.

Resource persons should be assigned to local schools.

Findings of the training and conference conducted in FY 79 are given in Appendix D. Forty-seven (47 newly trained persons attended the training and 35 responded to the evaluation questionnaire. The most frequently occuring responses indicating the need for technical assistance were: Suggestions 1 and 4. Respondents indicated on the 1-5 point scale positive responses of 50% or above on all items except "Was time allotted for each session adequate?", Where 91% indicated ascending degrees of insufficiency (See Appendix D).

Forty-four (44) previously trained administrators participated in the two and one-half day conference and 19 responded to the evaluation questionnaire. Their responses show that on a 5 point scale, all areas of the conference were rated at or above 78.9% or an average of 81.7% or more at the four and five point level of effectiveness for all factors evaluated.

The Right to Read State Director indicated that video taped training modules are being developed and will be ready for use in the Regions during the 1979-80 school year. It is projected that these tapes will be available for staff development purposes.

Objective 3: GIVEN A MANDATE TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RELATED TO THE DEVELOPMENT, ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF READING PROGRAMS, THE STATE RIGHT TO READ STAFF WILL: RESPOND TO REQUEST FOR FOLLOW-UP TRAINING ASSISTANCE WITHIN 3 DAYS; PROVIDE ON-GOING ASSISTANCE.

(Objective 3 continued)

Findings:

a. Results of the Participating Administrators Questionnaire indicate that technical assistance has been provided to the administrators participating in the training seminar as shown in Table 11. In addition extensive technical assistance has been provided on a statewide, regional and local basis as shown on Technical Assistance Logs provided by the Right to Read Program Director.

TABLE 11

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY RIGHT TO READ PROGRAM AS INDICATED ON THE RIGHT TO READ PROGRAM LOG

Areas of Assistance	Frequency
Right to Read Orientation	4
Teacher Training	12
Planning Sessions	12
Organizing Reading Task-Force	8
Summer Workshop	12
Others	3

Sample of administrators who had participated in the Right to Read Leadership training verified that technical assistance was rendered by the Right to Read staff as indicated on log and in Table 11.

Objective 4: GIVEN THE NEED TO INFORM AND INVOLVE ALL SEGMENTS OF THE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY, THE RIGHT TO READ STAFF WILL UTILIZE A VARIETY OF MEDIA AND STRATEGIES TO MAXIMIZE IMPACT.

(Objective 4 continued)

Findings:

a. Although criteria have not been developed for validation of reading programs, skills on the PRT were matched with the skills covered in the Success in Reading Project.

b. Agenda provided by Right to Read Program Director shows conference was conducted for administrators, teachers and community members. A comparison of the participants lists of previous conferences and 1978-79 conference list shows that previously trained administrators were involved in the conference, as well as, a cadre of new administrators (See Table 3, Page 25).

c. The Staff Interview Instrument and documents provided by the Right to Read state office indicated that the following materials were provided by the Right to Read Program for informing and involving various segments of school and community in the Right to Read Effort.

- Right to Read Express
- Revised Standards of Excellence
- Right to Read Salutes: International Year of the Child Activities Guide.
- Right to Read Brochure
- Administrators' Conference Proceedings, 1978
- Tutorial Handbook
- Quarterly Articles for Advisory and Learning Exchange Newsletters
- Monthly Cemrel Publication "Reporting on Reading"

The results of the Participating Teacher Instrument indicated that materials disseminated by the Right to Read are:

- Guideline for Right to Read
- Guidebook - Right to Read Salute to IYC
- Memos describing/advertising contests
- Reading in the content Areas Packet

(Objective 4 continued)

- Posters
- Media Materials
- Information on how to write Proposals
- Information on available funds
- Research Materials

d. Results of Staff Interview Instrument indicate that the following materials were disseminated and strategies implemented related to establishing and publicizing the high priority of reading:

1. District of Columbia Public Schools Office of Communication press releases on Right to Read Activities.

The results of the Staff Interview Instrument indicate that the press releases were disseminated on Right to Read International Year of the Child activities and other activities sponsored by the Right to Read Program. (Example: Success in Reading and Writing Program).

2. Right to Read International Year of the Child Activities

Data provided by the Right to Read Staff showed that the 1978-79 Program Year supported activities related to the International Year of the Child. "A Right to Read International Year of the Child Activities Guide" was developed and provided to all schools.

The data provided by staff and school personnel showed that all regions and schools were involved in Right to Read International Year of the Child Activities. Contests were judged at the school level and regionally. Finalists from each region participated in a city wide final awards day ceremony at Emery Elementary School-judged the Right to Read Exemplary Enviroment School.

Of the participating schools sampled, the following results were given by administrators, teachers and students regarding their participation in Right to Read International Year of the Child activities.

The Participating Administrators' Questionnaire indicated that teachers and students in their schools participated in the following activities during the Right to Read Program year:

(Objective 4 continued)

- Mascot (2 administrators)
- Spelling Bee (4 administrators)
- Writing Skills
- Book Fair
- Television Program
- Story Hour
- Special Bulletin Board
- Essay Competition
- Poetry Writing (2 administrators)
- Book Contest
- Research Contest

3. WTOP Channel 9 - 1978-79 WRC Channel 4 - 1978-79.

4. Results of Staff Interview Instrument indicate that bumper stickers were not distributed in the 1978-79 Project year. They were distributed in the 1975-78 Program years.

The Student Questionnaire data showed that the majority of the students in 12 sample schools participated in one or more Right to Read International Year of the Child activities as represented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN RIGHT TO READ ACTIVITIES AS INDICATED BY STUDENTS IN THE 12 SAMPLE SCHOOLS N=630

Activity	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Responses
Mascot contest	9	0.7
Poster Contest	126	9.5
Oratorical Contest	31	2.3
Spelling Bees	175	13.3
Reading Research	153	11.6
Book Club	130	9.8
Essay	105	8.0
Best Dressed School	110	8.3
Poetry	141	10.7
Other	112	8.5
No Response & (None)	228	17.3
TOTAL	1320	100.0

(Objective 4 continued)

Results of the Teacher Questionnaire show that of the 12 schools sampled the majority of the teachers in schools participated in Right to Read International Year of the Child Activities.

5. Yearly Right to Read Mascot

   The Right to Read Mascot was selected through city wide competition during the Right to Read program year 1978-79.

6. Quarterly Newsletter to local reading directors

   The Right to Read Express is published and disseminated quarterly at the D.C. local school level and to all state Right to Read directors. Right to Read activities are published in all regional newsletters and quarterly issues of the Advisory and Learning Exchange Newsletters.

e. The results of the Staff Interview Instrument indicated the following efforts to broaden community participation and to involve the private sector.

- Advisory and Learning Exchange
- University of the District of Columbia
- Baltimore Summer Camp - Training of 6 volunteer tutors
- State Dept/HEW Conference - International Literary Day
- Advisory and Learning Exchange - D.C. History Project
- Washington Post - Planning for Newspaper Reading Project
- Volunteer Agencies
- Reading is Fundamental
- Gibson Nursery
- Catholic University
- Martin Luther King Library
- Spanish Educational Development Center
- D.C. Superior Court
- School Without Walls
- Junior League

(Objective 4 continued)

- College Skills Center
- Takoma Theater
- Kalorama House
- National Capital Parks
- St. Lukes Catholic Church
- Gallaudet College
- St. Thomas More Church
- Children's Museum
- D.C. Department of Human Resources

f. Results of the Staff Interview Instrument indicate that there are 4 aspects of the tutorial services provided by the Right to Read Program:

1. Tutorial Referral Services

Results of the Staff Interview Instrument show that the Right to Read State Office refers tutorial requests to appropriate volunteer agencies. The Right to Read staff has served in screening various potential tutors and referring them appropriately. The Technical Assistance and Work Log indicated that approximately 25 tutorial referral conferences were held during the 1978-79 project year. In addition referral services and procedures were planned with various programs and facilities, ranging from those serving preschoolers to those serving adults. Also much coordinating with schools for tutorial referrals and services was facilitated by the Right to Read Office.

2. Training of Volunteer Tutors

Findings of the Volunteer Agency Questionnaire and the Staff Interview Instrument indicate that a major focus of the Volunteer Agency Task Force was training of volunteer tutors and providing technical assistance in designing successful volunteer tutorial programs to community programs offering these services. The strengthening of resources of public schools in serving and coordinating with these agencies was a major thrust. This Task Force was formed by the Right to Read Office as a response to the need for more coordinated efforts related to volunteer tutoring (See Chapter VI Right to Read Final Evaluation Report 1977-78) was the

identification of tutorial needs, training of volunteers to serve those needs, and assisting with development of appropriate programs to meet the identified needs.

3. Provision of Technical Assistance and Coordination of Volunteer Agencies

The Staff Interview Instrument and the Volunteer Agency Questionnaire results indicated that the Right to Read Staff provided technical assistance on an as needed basis to volunteer agencies. Additionally, results showed that coordination between agencies to share resources had been facilitated by the Right to Read Staff Office.

4. Screening and Dissemination of Appropriate Tutorial Materials

A major area of need identified by the Right to Read staff in collaboration with volunteer agencies was identification and provision of adequate and appropriate materials to be utilized for tutoring. The State Office recommended and/or distributed appropriate materials, if available for use in tutorial programs of volunteer agencies.

A summary of the activities of the State Office of Right to Read and the Volunteer Agency Task Force are presented in Table 13 (See next page).

Table 13

CATEGORIZATION OF VOLUNTEER TASK FORCE MEETINGS, 1978-1979

Identification of Tutorial Needs	Training of Volunteers	Providing Appropriate Tutorial Materials
Nov. 78 Planning for training Peer Tutors at McKinley Feb. 79 Discussion on the school and the black child. Conference - Preparation for Volunteer Task Force Meeting April, 79 Meeting (Minor Adult Ed. Ctr.) Meeting - State Right to Read Sept. 79 - Conference - Suggestions for setting up tutorial program - Preparation for providing tutorial services	Aug. 1978 Training of volunteers (6) Sept. 78 Training in order to volunteer services Dec. 18, 1978 Volunteer recruitment and training Feb. 79 Conference - Volunteer Tutor March, 1979 Conference - Tutoring Services Sept. 1979 Tutorial Services	Nov. 78 Meeting on outreach and sources for tutorial materials Jan. 1979 Discussion of information on mailing list and sources for assistance of all kinds. March, 1979 - Conference - tutoring assistance for mentally retarded adults - Conference - materials for volunteers - Meeting (Ward 8) volunteer materials

CHAPTER V

EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS

Program Effectiveness

The National Right to Read Office Performance Report indicates that reports to the National Right to Read Office should "Describe the degree to which each project objective proposed in your approved application(s) has been accomplished during this reporting period. Please restate the objectives as they originally appeared in the application. The description should be inclusive of, but not limited to the following topics:

For State Education Agency Based Projects

a. Statewide surveys and needs assessment.

b. Validation of promising reading practices/programs.

c. Preparation and certification of teachers as related to reading.

d. Standards of Excellence for reading programs.

e. An exemplary training program for administrators responsible for reading.

f. The development of any written and audio visual products.

g. Dissemination of information.

h. Technical assistance.

i. State Education Agency Task Force.

j. State Advisory Council

k. Evaluation of project objectives and other evaluation results.

In those cases where established objectives were not met, state delays or adverse conditions which have materially affected

the ability to attain program objectives, prevented meeting of time schedules and goals, or precluded the attainment of project work units. Please state action taken to resolve the situation."

The Analysis of Findings and other data generated by the Right to Read Effort indicate that the Program has implemented activities related to each of its objectives. A summary analysis of each program objective and accomplishments related to each are given in Table 14.

Table 14

ANALYSIS OF RIGHT TO READ
OBJECTIVE(S) ACCOMPLISHED

Objective(s)	Summary of Accomplishment(s)
1. Based on the 20 Criterion which constitute the proposed Standards of Excellence, the State Right to Read staff will conduct a comprehensive statewide "pyramidal" needs assessment of reading in D.C.	
a. Identify the reading achievement of students.	This subobjective has been accomplished with ongoing updates of needs based on testing. The Right to Read State Office produced a needs assessment document in February of 1979.
b. Identify target population of students with reading needs.	This objective has been a major area of program implementation of this program year. Continual monitoring of needs has enabled the State Right to Read Office to identify major reading needs and collaboratively design, test and implement programs along with school personnel, to serve the student showing greatest need.

Table 14 (Contd)

Objective(s)	Summary of Accomplishment(s)
c. Identify the local districts that have not yet participated in the Administrators Training Program.	This sub-objective was accomplished. The State Office of Right to Read, through the needs assessment process established in the previous project year, identified administrators in all school districts who had not participated in the Administrators Training Seminar. As a result 47 new administrators were trained in the 1978-79 program year.
d. Assess the personnel needs for in-service and other leadership activities.	This sub-objective was accomplished. Needs were assessed as specified in (c) above. Also data from participating administrators and teachers indicate that more comprehensive needs assessment is being prepared at the local school level.
e. Assess needs relative to the appropriateness and opportunities in reading pre-service and in-service training and certification of teachers, administrators and other educational personnel.	This sub-objective was accomplished as shown in the minutes of the Communiversity meetings. The D.C. School System Board of Examiners office has developed a standardized certification procedure for reading. There was extensive collaboration with the area universities. College curriculum offerings are now being matched with certification standards. Reciprocity of certification now exists between the District of Columbia and 25 other state jurisdictions.

Table 14 (Cont'd.)

Objective(s)	Summary of Accomplishment(s)
f. Produce a needs assessment document.	This sub-objective was accomplished. As shown in Chapter II of this report, the most recent needs assessment document was produced in February of 1979. This document is currently being revised.
g. Provide for periodic updating of needs assessment data.	This sub-objective was accomplished this program year. The Right to Read staff has obtained reading achievement data from the D. C. Schools, Department of Pupil Appraisal on a periodic basis.
2. Given a cadre of committed administrators, the State Right to Read effort will provide training experiences covering a minimum of 60 hours of activity per participant.	
a. The training program will be based on the in-service needs assessment conducted by the Right to Read on the Standards of Excellence for reading.	This sub-objective has been accomplished. It has been one of the major areas of activity of the Right to Read Program in 1978-79 year as it has been in previous years. Forty-seven new administrators were assessed and trained during the 1978-79 program year; 33 were trained in the 1975-76 program year; and, 56 in the 1977-78 program year for a total of 136 trained administrators to date.

Table 16 (Cont'd)

Objective(s)	Summary of Accomplishment(s)
b. The Right to Read staff conduct 24-day training programs for public and private nonprofit local administrators.	This sub-objective necessitated a revision as shown in Table 2. A three-day training session was conducted for 47 new administrators on August 27 thru 29, 1979. A two and one-half day conference was conducted for all previously trained administrators - 44 of whom had attended seminars in the summer of 1976 and 1978. This re-scheduling was necessary because of school system priorities and a spring teachers' strike.
c. The 24-day training program will include knowledge in the areas of reading, program management and change agent.	The training sessions included specific knowledge in the areas of reading, program management and change agent skills as evidenced from each day's agenda of the training sessions and from the evaluation results of each training session (See Appendix C).
3. Given a mandate to provide technical assistance related to the development, organization and administration of reading programs, the State Right to Read staff will: • respond to request for follow-up training assistance within three days. • provide on-going assistance.	

Table 14 (Cont'd.)

Objective(s)	Summary of Accomplishment(s)
a. The Right to Read staff provide follow-up assistance to training participants.	The Right to Read State Office has provided extensive technical assistance and follow-up assistance to training participants as indicated in the monthly Technical Assistance and Work Logs provided by the State Director. Also, Admintrators and Teachers indicate that the level of technical assistance and follow-up by the Right to Read staff has increased.
4. Given the need to inform and involve all segments of the schools and community, the Right to Read staff will utilize a variety of media and strategies to maximize impact.	
a. Establish criteria for validation reading programs.	As specified, the criteria for validation have not been developed; however, some related activities have occurred (See Page 41).
b. The Right to Read staff will provide dissemination of innovative approaches and exemplary practices by conducting a statewide Right to Read Conference.	This sub-objective was accomplished. Attendants at the conference were administrators, teachers and community members.

Objective(s)	Summary of Accomplishment(s)
c. The Right to Read will disseminate Right to Read materials made available through USOE and the State Office.	This sub-objective was accomplished. The State Office made a concerted effort to engage in dissemination activities during this program year.
d. The D. C. Right to Read will provide the high priority of reading.	This sub-objective was accomplished as a major thrust of Project activities this year. The Right to Read activities throughout the year were around the theme of the "International Year of the Child"; as opposed to focusing on a Right to Read Month as in Previous program years.
e. Initiate broader community participation through the coordination of efforts, involving the private sector.	This sub-objective was accomplished. However, involvement of a broader cadre of the private sector is suggested.
f. Initiate broader community participation through soliciting and referring volunteers.	This sub-objective was a major accomplishment of the Right to Read State Office. The State Director and staff have worked with and organized volunteer agencies into a resourceful group for providing for volunteer reading needs within the District of Columbia.

Summary:

The Right to Read Program has four (4) major objectives and seventeen (17) sub-objectives. The analysis shows that the Right to Read State Office has moved forward in accomplishing each of the objectives and sub-objectives. Specifically, four (4) major objectives were accomplished in the 1978-79 project year. Thus, the Right to Read Effort fully implemented its objectives to date.

Staff Responsibilities

The Staff Interview Instrument was structured to show job roles and Project activities for which each Right to Read staff member has had responsibility. An analysis of the job roles and functions of each based on the results of the Staff Interview Instrument are represented here.

> Project Director - Responsibilities indicated as manager and administrator of the Right to Read Project. Responsible for providing technical assistance to schools through administrators, training a cadre of administrators; to design and implement exemplary reading programs. Provides assistance to volunteer agencies as a clearinghouse.

The following two positions were funded by the D. C. Public Schools:

> Assistant Director - Responsibilities indicated as back-up for the Project Director. Assists with all activities. Specifically, is responsible for the training of the volunteer tutors. Also, serves as chairperson of the Reading Textbook Committee for the D. C. Public Schools. Retired as of 12/31/78. No replacement.

> Reading Specialist - Responsibilities indicated as assisting with recruiting and structuring of Right to Read proposal to assure that content is inside government guidelines. Also, maintain and monitor all volunteer service including: maintenance of records and follow-up; volunteer tutoring requests and placements. Retired as of 2/1/79. No replacement.

Task Force Participation

Answers compiled from the Task Force Questionnaire and compilation of minutes of Task Force meetings indicate that the Task Force has actively functioned during this implementation year.

See summary of Task Force activities in Table 15

TABLE 15

SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE ACTIVITIES
SY 1978-79

Date of Meeting	Purpose	location
September 16, 1978	Planning for FY 78-79	Lovejoy
October 8, 1978	Viewing new materials.	Skyline Inn
October 18, 1978	Reviewing and Refinement of Plans.	Lovejoy
November 6, 1978	Presentations on Voluntary program	Lovejoy
December 8, 1978	Selection of committee to plan specific IYC activities	Lovejoy
December 11, 1978	Writing guidelines for Right to Read contest	Lovejoy
December 15, 1978	Reviewing guidelines	Lovejoy
December 19, 1978	Reviewing guidelines	Lovejoy
January 3, 1979	Organizing year's activities	Lovejoy
January 12, 1979	Planning for month of February - April	Lovejoy

Table 15 continued

Date of Meeting	Purpose	Location
January 29, 1979	Planning for month of February - April	Lovejoy
April 6, 1979	Planning final IYC activities	Lovejoy
May 11, 1979	Planning for City-wide Judging and Awards	Lovejoy
May 22, 1979	City-wide Awards	Bunker Hill
June 15, 1979	Evaluation and Planning for 1979-80	

From the Task Force Questionnaire the following suggestions to improve Right to Read performance were delineated. (1) All reading programs need to keep Right to Read office appraised of their existence and progress; (2) assessment data needs to be more readily available and usable in planning; (3) planning should be done before school opens; (4) a media committee should be developed to disseminate information about Right to Read projects.

Advisory Council Participation

The Advisory Council Questionnaire and minutes reveal that the Advisory Council has met its meeting obligations for the SY 1978-79 implementation year as shown in Table 16.

Table 16

ANALYSIS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETINGS

Date of Meeting	Purpose	Location
November 13, 1978	Organization	Lovejoy
November 13, 1978	R_2R Activities; Constitution	Lovejoy
February 28, 1979	R_2R Activities	Lovejoy
April 19, 1979	"New Directions"	M. L. King Library

Analysis of attendance records of the meetings held by the Advisory Council shows that approximately one third membership was in attendance. The Advisory Council members responding to the Questionnaire recommended the following to improve the Right to Read Program.

- Full staffing of the Right to Read Office
- Measurement of Right to Read overall impact on reading in the District of Columbia
- Maintenance or expansion of communication with those involved in the actual implementation of Right to Read program
- Encouragement of more participation in Right to Read activities in school and community
- More meetings of the Advisory Council.

CHAPTER VI

Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

The result of formative and summative evaluation show that the Right to Read Program has accomplished all of its four major objectives. As is the case in any developing program, some of the related sub-objectives were revised to reflect the systematic needs of the program's implementation strategies.

The Right to Read Program has created a climate of interest and commitment within the school system and community of Washington, D. C. The program has moved forward in the 1978-79 program year to continue to give the guidance and assistance to school personnel and community organizations to implement effective strategies and programs to combat illiteracy. Funds and staff must be provided by the D. C. System to allow the Right to Read Program to move to further implement its objectives, if the Right to Read Program is to realize its full potential by 1980 - the target year for Right to Read . With this prospective in focus, the following recommendations are made for the 1979-80 Program year.

Right to Read Program Recommendations:

1. Regional Superintendents and principals of each participating school should be met with at the beginning of the year and periodically during the school year to formulate and monitor Right to Read plans for participating schools and to plan strategies for pinpointing target schools for training sessions.

2. Formative and Summative evaluation have been conducted each year for the Right to Read Program. These have been process and product oriented for the most part. These evaluations must begin to look at the outcomes of program implementation. It is, therefore, recommended that formative and summative evaluation based on reading achievement be a major evaluation approach for the next Right to Read Program year.

D. C. School System Recommendation in support of the Right to Read Program.

1. The Right to Read State Office has been active in reviewing and testing exemplary reading programs for populations similar to those of the District of Columbia. As specified previously, the exemplary programs are currently being piloted with the support of the Right to Read State Office. The Right to Read State Office staff should not have the additional responsibility of implementing the exemplary programs once they are identified. These programs and their objective outcomes are important to the quality of reading provided the children of the District of Columbia. It is, therefore, recommended that exemplary reading programs be fully staffed to realize their optimum effectiveness.

2. Adequate funding must be provided to the Right to Read Program so that the effort is a comprehensive approach to the institutionalization of an exemplary process to eliminate illiteracy. This evaluation vividly shows that a phenomenal job has to be done by a Project Director with only two clerical staff. The data clearly depict that the Director has to be an energetic, dedicated professional to have accomplished so much this year, with so little. The evaluator is recommending that the following at a minimum be implemented if the Right to Read Program of the District of Columbia is to continue to accomplish its Program objectives:

   a. The Project Director must have the support staff necessary to continue to implement those efforts of the community and schools in a systematic, effective and efficient manner. At a minimum, a coordinator for the community component and a coordinator for the school component should be required. Based upon an analysis of the Right to Read Program objectives, the evaluator recommends staff responsibilities as shown in Table 17.

Table 17

RECOMMENDED STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES

STAFF POSITION	RESPONSIBILITIES (Objectives; Sub-Objective)
State Director	1a, c, d, e, f; 2a; 3a; 4a, e, d
Assistant Directors (2)	1b, g; 2b, c; 3a; 4b, c, d
Reading Specialist/ Researcher	3a; 4b, c, d, e, f

b. The Right to Read Program needs to continually monitor needs assessment data for all schools and for the community of the District of Columbia. A monitoring procedure must be established for participating schools this year. Data clearly reveals that this is sorely needed. A research assistant to coordinate, monitor and document needs assessment and other data related to program accomplishments should be funded and housed within the Right to Read Office.

APPENDIX A

Standards of Excellence

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RIGHT TO READ
STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE FOR READING*/

June 6, 1977

Program Planning

1. There is total staff commitment to pupil learning.

2. There is at the local school level a team, being responsible for the development, coordination and maintenance of a quality reading program.

3. The reading program, including pre-school through adult basic education, involves in planning and making changes, the school faculty, school board members, administrators, parents, students and leaders of cultural and educational resources of the area.

4. Staff competencies in reading instruction and attitudes toward reading instruction are assessed to determine adequacy for carrying out the program effectively.

5. Program is guided by set of goals that state sepcific instructional objectives for a defined curriculum for all learners in the aptitude continuum.

6. A comprehensive needs assessment serves as a basis for systematic planning and change.

Instructional Program

1. The instructional program is adapted to achieve programmatic goals in the affective, cognitive and psychomotor areas which consider the differenciated levels and contents of instruction which support the stages of readiness, rates and modalities of learning and special needs and problems of all students.

2. The curriculum defines the minimum skills to be acquired by each student who graduates from the D.C. Public Schools. The acquisition of those skills will be determined by competency-based assessment.

3. The staff provides instruction necessary for a complete reading program in which emphasis is given to comprehension, word recognition, study skills and survival reading skills; listening and writing skills at all levels.

*/Revised as a result of Delphi consensus.

Instructional Program, (con't.)

4. The reading program provides a variety of learning experiences, materials and library resources appropriate to the instructional objectives.

5. There is a continuous progress organization of the reading curriculum.

6. The material used in the reading program should be free of any racial, cultural, and sex biases.

7. The educational setting and staff shows evidence of an understanding of human behavior, the effects of environmental stress on the learner, and the culturally diverse experience backgrounds of students.

8. The program provides for systematic record-keeping, reporting, interpreting and documenting information of student progress and program effectiveness.

9. The staff uses bilingual educational methods and techniques with students who are limited in English speaking ability.

10. A cadre of trained community volunteer reading helpers assist school staff in the implementation of its goals involving students in reading materials from a wide variety of occupations.

Staff Development

1. There is on-going intensive and extensive inservice education for the total administrative, teaching, and supportive staff including aides, substitute teachers, volunteers, tutors, parents and others who work with students

2. The Board of Education will require that every applicant hired for a teaching position should have pre-service preparation of a minimum of six hous in the teaching of reading, to render them able to demonstrate the use of effective techniques.

3. The Board of Education has established an incentive program for teacher-in-service education.

Dissemination

1. Each local school provides information about the need, purpose, and progress of its reading program to parents and other members of the community.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RIGHT TO READ STATE OFFICE OLD BROOKLAND SCHOOL
TENTH AND MONROE STREETS, N.E. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20017

NELLIE R. LEWIS, STATE DIRECTOR (202) 576-6067

FINAL DRAFT
(Before Delphi Consensus)

PROPOSED STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE FOR READING PROGRAMS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1976 - 80

A. PROGRAM PLANNING

1. The school board participates in policy changes related to the reading program.

2. There is at the local school level someone who has been designated as being responsible for the development and maintenance of a quality reading program.

3. The program planning involves leaders of the cultural and educational resources of the area being served, including institutions of higher education, nonprofit private schools, public and private nonprofit agencies such as libraries, museums, educational radio and television, and other cultural and educational resources of the community.

4. Planning for program change is systematic.

5. There are full time coordinators of all the administrative facets of the reading program.

6. The reading program and interest in reading are actively supported by the school faculty, school board members, administration, parents, and students.

7. A local school site task force (composed of principals, teachers, reading personnel, students, parents and community representatives) is participating in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the program goals.

8. There is an adult basic education component.

9. There is a pre-school component which involves parents.

10. A comprehensive needs assessment serves as a basis of planning and change.

11. Staff competencies are assessed to determine if they are adequate for carrying out the program effectively.

STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE FOR READING PROGRAM

B. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM - Continued

24. Current school and public library resources are available to promote reading among all segments of the population.

25. The instructional program is adapted to meet the varying stages of readiness, rates and modalities of learning, and special needs and problems of all children.

26. There is a continuous progress organization of the reading curriculum.

27. The materials of instruction are varied and appropriate to the instructional objectives of the reading program as well as to the developmental needs of the learner.

28. The curriculum defines the minimum skills to be acquired by each student who graduates from the D.C. Public Schools. The acquisition of those skills will be determined by a competency - based test.

29. Adjustments are made for varying reading levels in all subject areas.

30. The materials used in the reading program should be free of any racial, cultural and sex biases.

31. The program provides for comprehensive, systematic record keeping as the student progresses through the academic continuum.

32. The program provides for systematic reporting, interpreting and documenting of individual student progress to parents or guardians.

33. Information used in evaluation of learner progress of program effectiveness comes from a variety of sources, both formal and informal.

34. The program makes provision for the teaching of functional survival reading skills at all levels.

35. The Board of Education has established an incentive program for teacher in-service education in reading.

36. The program provides appropriate staff development for teachers, aides, and other ancillary educational personnel including substitute teachers, aimed toward improving their abilities in teaching reading...

APPENDIX B

Instruments Utilized for the Evaluation

RIGHT TO READ PROGRAM EVALUATION

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

1. What is the overall purpose of the Right-To-Read Program?

2. What are the major objectives of the Right-to-Read Program?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

   e. _____

3. What is your current position in the Right-to-Read Program?

4. What specific activities are required for the performance of your job role?

5. Were you involved in other roles related to the Right-to-Read program prior to assuming your present position? If so, give information on each role.

6. What other persons are employed by the project and in what capacities?

7. In what ways, if any, do you feel that a reorganization of staff would make for a more efficient program operation?

8. What specific activities have been carried out since the implementation of the Right-to-Read Program? Indicate which ones you were directly involved in and the role you assumed in each. Also indicate which Right-to-Read objective(s) listed in #2 was related to the activity.

ACTIVITY	DATES	PURPOSE	RESULTS	ROLE	RELATED OBJECTIVE(S)

9. What Right-to-Read Program activities are currently in progress? Give the purpose for each and the role in which you serve.

ACTIVITY	DATES	PURPOSE	ROLE	RELATED OBJECTIVE(S)

10. What activities have been planned to occur between now and June 30, 1979? Give the purpose for each and the role in which you are to serve.

ACTIVITY	DATES	PURPOSE	ROLE	RELATED OBJECTIVE(S)

11. What activities have been conducted to increase public awareness about the Right-to-Read Program? How effective was each activity in improving increased public awareness?

1978-79:

12. What activities have been conducted to promote administrative support for the Right-to-Read Program from D. C. Schools?

1978-79:

How effective was each activity in increasing administrative support for the Right-to-Read Program?

13. What activities of the Right-to-Read Program have promoted support from the District of Columbia government, including the Office of the Mayor? Indicate the results of each activity.

1978-79:

14. What Right-to-Read Program activities have promoted support from the community at large? How effective was each activity in accomplishing this goal?

1978-79:

15. What other program activities, if implemented, do you feel would contribute most significantly to the accomplishment of the Right-to-Read objectives? In what ways would each contribute?

16. Approximately how many requests for reading tutorial instruction have been made of the Right-to-Read staff by persons in the community? Give list of names, dates of request, and agencies to which referred, if available.

Approx. no. of requests during 1978-79: _____

17. Who is responsible for training volunteer reading tutors and how are these tutors utilized in the Right-to-Read Program? Please provide a list of names of tutors.

18. What agencies have provided services related to the Right-to-Read Program during:

1978-79?

19. In what ways have you been involved with the Right-to-Read State Advisory Council?

20. What tasks have the Advisory Council carried out since the implementation of the Program? Are minutes of all meetings available?

1978-79:

20. cont'd.

What tasks which were assigned to the Advisory Council were not carried out and why?

21. In what ways has the work of the Advisory Council been supportive to you in the performance of your job role?

22. In what ways have you been involved with the Right-to-Read State Task Force?

23. What tasks have been performed by the Task Force since the implementation of the Right-to-Read Program?

1978-79:

What tasks which were assigned to the Task Force were not carried out and why?

23. cont'd.

24. In what ways has the activities of the Task Force been supportive to you in the performance of your job role?

25. What procedures have been used by the Right-to-Read Program to identify the target population of students in the District of Columbia with reading needs?

26. In what specific activities has the Right-to-Read Program engaged related to the following expected results or benefits? Provide documentation wherever possible.

a. A comprehensive needs assessment document which reflects both the strengths and weaknesses of reading services, both in the schools and the communities.

ACTIVITY ALREADY IMPLEMENTED 1978-79:	ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED:

26. cont'd.

b. An exemplary training program for administrators.

ACTIVITIES ALREADY IMPLEMENTED 1978-79:	ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED

c. An effected program of technical assistance related to the development, organization and administration of reading programs in local educational agencies and appropriate non-profit agencies and schools.

ACTIVITIES ALREADY IMPLEMENTED 1978-79:	ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED

d. The wide dissemination of information to assist in the development, organization and administration of reading programs both in schools and community agencies offering reading services.

ACTIVITIES ALREADY IMPLEMENTED 1978-79:	ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED

26. cont'd.

ACTIVITIES ALREADY IMPLEMENTED 1978-79	ACTIVITIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED

27. What activities has the Right-to-Read Program carried out to document students' reading achievement?

1978-79:

28. What specific recommendations would you as a Right-to-Read Project Staff member make to improve the Right-to-Read Program?

RIGHT-TO-READ PROJECT

TASK FORCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Organization Representing _____ Position _____

Directions: Please answer each of the following which solicits your opinions of and participation in the Right-to-Read Project.

1. I have participated as a member of the R2R Task Force representing

_____

2. I have attended the following meetings of the R2R Task Force

MEETING DATE	PURPOSE	LOCATION	RESULTS

3. List the things which you feel have helped this group move forward in assisting the Right-to-Read Project.

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

D. _____

E. _____

4. List the things which you feel have hindered this group's progress:

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

D. _____

E. _____

5. List suggestions and recommendations which you have for improving the Right-to-Read Project.

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

RIGHT-TO-READ PROJECT

ADVISORY COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE

Organization Representing _____Position_____

Directions: Please answer each of the following which solicits your opinions of and participation in the Right-to-Read Project.

1. I have participated as a member of the R2R Advisory Council representing: _____

   _____

2. I have attended the following meetings of the R2R Advisory Council.

   MEETING DATE PURPOSE LOCATION RESULTS

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. List the things which you feel have helped this group move forward in assisting the Right-to-Read Project.

   A. _____

   B. _____

   C. _____

   D. _____

   E. _____

4. List the things which you feel have hindered this group's progress:

   A. _____

   B. _____

   C. _____

   D. _____

   E. _____

5. List suggestions and recommendations which you have for improving the Right-to-Read Project.

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

Instrument #1 Participating Administrators Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION

The following instrument is designed to solicit the opinion and perception of administrators in reference to the Right-to-Read Project. The questionnaire should be given to the regional personnel, principal, assistant principals, and other persons who have participated in the Right-to-Read administrators training program.

Right-to-Read Project
(DCPS)

Name of School _____ Position _____

Instrument #1

PARTICIPATING ADMINISTRATORS QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Answer each of the following:

1. The purpose of the DCPS Right-to-Read Project is:

2. I was a participant in the administrators training workshop sponsored by the Right-to-Read Project in 1975-76 school year. a. ____ Yes
b. ____ No

3. The administrators training program was helpful in assisting me in the following ways:

   a. _____ Helped me gain more competence to design and implement an effective reading program based on needs.

   b. _____ Assisted me in defining procedures for assessing student needs.

   c. _____ Assisted me in defining procedures for assessing teacher and staff development needs.

   d. _____ Other _____

4. The administrators training program was not helpful to me because it:

   a. _____ Did not provide any new information that I found helpful in implementing and upgrading the reading program in my school, region, etc.

   b. _____ Was not structured to provide for those things which I really feel are needed to upgrade the reading program of my school(s), or region.

   c. _____ Other _____

5. As a result of my participation in the Right-to-Read administrators training workshop, I have implemented the following to upgrade the reading program in my school(s), or region:

   a. _____

   _____

   _____

b. _____

_____

_____

c. _____

_____

_____

6. As a result of the changes which I have implemented in the reading program, I have observed the following changes in teachers in my school(s), or region:

   a. _____ Teachers have a better understanding of needs assessment and its importance to teaching reading.

   b. _____ Teachers are more competent at diagnosing reading needs of students.

   c. _____ Teachers have gained more skills in use of teaching techniques and methodologies that more appropriately meet certain student reading needs.

   d. _____ Parents and teachers work more closely in planning student's education needs.

   e. _____ Other _____

7. I have requested and received assistance from the Right-to-Read office in the following areas:

	Area of Assistance	Date	Person(s) Providing Assistance
a.	_____	_____	_____
b.	_____	_____	_____
c.	_____	_____	_____

8. As a result of my participation in the Right-to-Read administrators training program, a long-range comprehensive plan for improvement of reading in my schools:

   a. _____ Has been developed.

   b. _____ Is being planned.

   c. _____ Will be planned _____.

   d. _____ Will be completed by _____.

   e. _____ Other _____

_____

9. List specific activities (including workshops, consultants, etc.) which you have held for teachers and other personnel to improve the reading program in your school(s), or regions:

a. Activity _____

Purpose _____

Number of persons participating _____ Date _____

Results _____

b. Activity _____

Purpose _____

Number of persons participating _____ Date _____

Results _____

c. Activity _____

Purpose _____

Number of persons participating _____ Date _____

Results _____

d. Activity _____

Purpose _____

Number of persons participating _____ Date _____

Results _____

e. Activity _____

Purpose _____

Number of persons participating _____ Date _____

Results _____

f. Activity _____

Purpose _____

Number of persons participating _____ Date _____

Results _____

10. The activities which have been implemented as a result of my participation in the Right-to-Read Project that have helped students improve their reading achievement most are:

a. _____

_____

b. _____

_____

c. _____

_____

11. The activities which have been implemented as a result of my participation in the Right-to-Read Project that have helped teachers improve their teaching of reading most are:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

12. I would like to see the following changes to improve the Right-to-Read Project:

A. Changes in administrators training program:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

B. Changes in Right-to-Read Project approach to providing technical assistance:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

C. Other changes in the Right-to-Read Project:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

13. I have used the Right-to-Read Standards of Excellence to _____

_____

14. Teachers and students in my school(s) participated in the following activities during Right-to-Read month:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

Right-to-Read Program
(DCPS)

Name of School: _____ Date _____

Instrument #2

Teacher Questionnaire

Direction: Answer each of the following.

1. Have you been involved in activities related to the Right-to-Read Program?

   Yes _____

   No _____

2. What specific activities have you been involved in that were sponsored by the Right-to-Read Program?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

3. What specific information and materials have been provided to you on the Right-to-Read Program?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

4. Have reading volunteers served in your school or classroom who were provided by the Right-to-Read Program?

   a. _____ Yes b. _____ No

   How effective were these volunteers in providing tutoring to students?

   a. _____ Very effective b. _____ Somewhat effective

   c. _____ Not effective at all

5. What specific activities have been sponsored by your school to upgrade reading achievement?

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

6. What needs assessment activities have you participated in with the Right-to Read Program?

a. _____

b. _____

7. Has the Right-to-Read Program provided any technical assistance in reading to you and/or your school?

a. _____ Yes List _____

b. _____ I am not aware of any provided.

8. I would recommend the following to improve the reading program in my school:

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

9. My administrator's emphasis on reading has:

a. _____ Increased in the last year.

b. _____ Is about the same.

c. _____ Is not as great as I think it should be.

d. _____ Other _____

_____

10. Which of the following have you participated in:

a. _____ Developing a comprehensive plan for reading improvement in my school.

b. _____ Developing a comprehensive needs assessment document for my school.

c. _____ Workshops and meetings on ways to improve student's reading skills.

Right-to-Read Project
(DCPS)

Name of School: _____ Date _____

Instrument #3

Student Questionnaire

1. Have you heard of the Right-to-Read Project:

   a. _____ Yes

   b. _____ No

2. What activities have you participated in sponsored by the Right-to-Read Project:

   a. _____ Mascot Contest
   b. _____ Poster Contest
   c. _____ Oratorical Contest
   d. _____ Spelling Bees
   e. _____ Reading Research
   f. _____ Book Club
   g. _____ Essay
   h. _____ Best Dressed School
   i. _____ Poetry
   j. _____ Other _____

3. Which of the above activities did you find most helpful in improving your reading skills.

   List _____

4. What additional activities would you like to see sponsored by the Right-to-Read Project?

   List a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

5. What help in reading would you like to have?

   a. _____ Tutoring
   b. _____ More time spent in reading in my classroom
   c. _____ More reading required at home
   d. _____ Other _____

Right-to-Read

Volunteer Agency Questionnaire

Name of Agency _____

Position _____

Directions: Complete each of the following:

1. What meetings of the Volunteer Task Force have you attended in 1978-79?

Date	Location	Purpose	Results

2. Have you contacted the R_2R Office for technical assistance this year?

_____ yes _____ no

Comments: _____

_____

3. What areas of technical assistance were required?

____a. Reading Materials
____b. Training
____c. Tutorial Referrals
____d. Other

4. Has the R_2R Office utilized your expertise in providing technical assistance to other volunteer groups?

Date(s)	Topic/Area of Expertise

5. What type of volunteer tutorial services does your organization provide?

6. To what populations does your organization provide tutorial services? Age groups? _____

7. Have your organization been contacted by the R_2R Office to provide tutorial services to specific persons?

_____ yes

_____ no

Comments: _____

_____

APPENDIX C

Administrators Needs Assessment Instrument

THE ADMINISTRATOR'S SELF-ASSESSMENT SCALE

Organization and Administration of Reading Programs

PERSONAL DATA

Name_____School_____

Position_____Date_____

DIRECTIONS

The purpose of this survey is to determine the professional development needs of the members of this organization and to identify persons within the organization who could serve in positions of leadership in professional development activities.

For each item on the survey please indicate the state of your professional development by checking the appropriate number opposite the statement.

Use the following code:

Would like more information - 1
Feel confident - 2
Could provide leadership - 3

1. Knowledge of the elements which make up a balanced reading program. 1.____2.____3.____

2. Ability to create a climate in the school which enhances reading instruction. 1.____2.____3.____

3. Ability to help teachers to identify and define immediate and long-range goals and objectives. 1.____2.____3.____

4. Ability to assist individual and/or groups of teachers to identify specific reading needs and to develop prescriptions to meet those needs. 1.____2.____3.____

5. Ability to plan and guide a total building-wide reading program on the basis of standards which have been established by the staff. 1.____2.____3.____

6. Ability to encourage the effective use of resources by staff personnel. 1.____2.____3.____

7. Ability to assess the total reading program (criterion tests, ranking tests, diagnostic tests), the problems of early identification and methods for keeping records. 1.____2.____3.____

8. Ability to organize and schedule a building-wide or classroom testing program to assess reading needs and strengths. 1.____2.____3.____

ADMINISTRATOR'S SELF-ASSESSMENT SCALE
Page Two

CODE: Would like more information -1
Feel confident -2
Could provide leadership -3

9. Ability to organize a comprehensive reading program which includes developmental reading, reading improvement and remedial reading. 1.____2.____3.____

10. Ability to interpret test data to staff, students and community. 1.____2.____3.____

11. Ability to provide information to the community regarding the school's reading program. 1.____2.____3.____

12. Ability to help teachers coordinate and integrate reading into the total school curriculum. 1.____2.____3.____

13. Ability to assist teachers to design programs, experiences, and activities which will help students to maintain reading skills they have learned. 1.____2.____3.____

14. Ability to provide for the optimum effective and efficient utilization of space. 1.____2.____3.____

15. Skill in planning for the expenditure of funds to satisfy reading requirements identified by teachers. 1.____2.____3.____

16. Ability to integrate and coordinate the use of material and personnel resources (library, media, pupil personnel services). 1.____2.____3.____

17. Ability to design and implement staff development programs utilizing a variety of procedures such as meetings after school, released-time, etc. 1.____2.____3.____

18. Ability to make the most effective use of the teaching staff in terms of the overall reading program and the needs of the pupil population. 1.____2.____3.____

19. Ability to maximize the use of available materials and technology. 1.____2.____3.____

20. Knowledge of available research in reading which is shared with staff in terms of its implication for improving instruction. 1.____2.____3.____

21. Ability to organize staff and pupils for reading instruction. 1.____2.____3.____

22. Ability to provide meaningful on-site assistance to teachers relating to reading approaches, methods, and techniques. 1.____2.____3.____

23. Ability to organize a program which provides for continuous evaluation of reading instruction. 1.____2.____3.____

CODE: Would like more information -1
Feel confident -2
Could provide leadership -3

24. Ability to make materials and personal resources available and readily accessible to teachers and pupils. 1.____2.____3.____

25. Ability to provide leadership in developing criteria to guide in the selection and purchasing of reading materials. 1.____2.____3.____

26. Ability to help teachers utilize paraprofessional personnel such as aides and volunteers and to establish a tutorial program. 1.____2.____3.____

27. Ability to organize tutoring programs, including the use of peer tutors. 1.____2.____3.____

28. Ability to help teachers to write specific behavioral objectives and to implement them in their programs. 1.____2.____3.____

29. Ability to interpret and use data from educational research. 1.____2.____3.____

APPENDIX D

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STATE RIGHT TO READ ADVISORY COUNCIL

September, 1978

Mayor's Office

*Mr. Marion Barry
District Building
14th and E Streets, NW
Washington, DC 20004

City Council

Mrs. Hilda Mason
District Building
14th and E Streets, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Mr. Sterling Tucker
District Building
14th and E Streets, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Board of Education

Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Vincent E. Reed
415 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
724-4222

Ms. Minnie Woodson
415 12th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
724-4283

Government

Dr. Ettyce Moore
Dept. of Human Resources
1329 E Street, NW
Munsey Bldg.
Washington, DC
724-8814

Education

Ms. Ora S. Anderson, Chairperson
Reading Dept.
University of D.C
724 9th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
727-2903

*ex-officio

Education

Dr. Nancy Arnez
School of Education
Howard University
6101 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011
636-7354

Sr. Ursula Butler
Catholic Schools Offices
717 Fifth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
789-0074

Mr. Patrick W. Carlton
Educational Administration
VA Polytechnic Institute
and State University
Box 2054
Reston, VA 22090
(703) 437-7988
(703) 471-4600

Ms. Olive DeBruler
Dept. of Library Sciences - DCPS
Jefferson Administration Annex
801 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
724-4951

Dr. Leonard DeFiore
St. Mary's Hall
Catholic Office of Education
717 15 Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
737-3201

Dr. Nancy Dworkin
Director
Center for Unique Learners
15 Laird Street
Rockville, MD 20850
279-9048

Dr. Hardy Franklin, Director
DCPS Libraries
901 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
727-1101

Education

Ms. Thomasina Griffin
Region VI Educational
Center
Open Space Coordinator
Bunker Hill School
14th and Michigan Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20017
576-6062

Dr. Louis Kornhauser
Executive Assistant to the Dean
School of Education and Human
Development - GW University
Washington, D.C 20052
676-6160

Mrs. Elaine Melmed
Executive Director
Metropolitan Educational
Council Staff Development
1610 New Hampshire Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20009
667-3008

Ms. Ernestine Miller
Trinity College
Mich., Ave., and Franklin St., NE
Washington, DC 20017

Dr. Ruth Peterson
School of Education
George Washington University
c-436
Washington, DC 20052
676-6733

Ms. Almira PremDas
Supervisor
Region 4
Logan Administration Bldg.
3rd and G Streets, NE
Washington, DC 20002
724-4785

Mr. Robert Tarkington
Federal Programs
Presidential Bldg.
415 12th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
724-4230

Ms. Mary Turner
Adult Education
Presidential Bldg.
415 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
724-4178

Educational Resource Persons

Dr. James T. Guines
Associate Superintendent
Office of Instruction
Presidential Bldg.
415 12th Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20004
724-4173

Mr. Harris Taylor
Associate Director
Federal Programs
Presidential Bldg.
415 12th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
724-4230

Dr. Mildred Cooper
Asst. Superintendent
Dept. Research and Evaluation
Presidential Bldg.
415 12th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
724-4246

Attention: Ms. Veta Harrison

Ms. Eva B. Lofty
Asst. Director
Right to Read Office
Lovejoy Elementary School
727-5396/7

Ms. Mary L. Harris
Director
Right to Read Office
Lovejoy Elementary School
727-5396/7

Ms. Marjorie Burke
Supervisor, Region VI
Bunker Hill School
14th and Michigan Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20017

Mrs. Artie Williams
ESAA Archdiocese of Washington
Goding School
9th and F Streets, NE
Washington, DC 20002
724-4701

Dr. Doris Woodson
Services for Handicapped
415 12th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
724-4013

Region 1 - Dr. Reuben Pierce
Old Congress Heights School
6th and Alabama Ave., SE
Washington, DC 20020
767-7065

Region 2 - Dr. Dorothy Johnson
Jefferson Jr. High School
801 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
724-4967

Region 3 - Dr. Andrew E. Jenkins, III
Old Carver School
45th and Lee Streets, NE
Washington, DC 20019
724-4934

Region 4 - Dr. William Brown
Logan School
3rd and G Streets, NE
Washington, DC 20002
724-4785

Region 5 - Mr. William Saunders
Bruce Administration Center
770 Kenyon Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20010
576-6334

Region 6 - Dr. Gary Freeman
Shaed Elementary School
Douglass Street and Lincoln Rd., NE
Washington, DC 20002
576-6056

Community

Ms. Brenda Strong Nixon
Association for Renewal
in Education
1101 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
331-1707

Mr. Allen Avery
D.C. Congress, Parents
and Teachers
2130 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
338-5848

Ms. Lula Cole Dawson
D.C. Citizens for Better
Public Education
95 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
484-7030

Mrs. Inez Wheeler
1324 Underwood Street, NW
Washington, DC 20012
882-9433

Parents

Ms. Peggy Everheart
Two-W Tutor
Adams Community School
1820 Clydesdale Place, NW
#106
Washington, DC 20009
667-5410

Region 6 - Mrs. Anne Dennis
3349 Clay Street, NE
Washington, DC 20019
399-8449

Region 5 - Mrs. Shirley Fletcher
724- Gresham Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
462-1805

Region 4 - Mrs. Gina Shannon
517 7th Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
546-7275/581-4959

Business

Mr. James Vance
WRC-TV/NBC News
4001 Nebraska Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20016
686-4111

Armed Services

Student Affairs+

APPENDIX E

Right to Read State Task Force

Revised Task Force - 1977-78

Chairperson - State Director, Right to Read

Miss Mary L. Harris
Shaw Jr. High School
10th and Rhode Island Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
673-7725

Assistant Director, Right to Read

Mrs. Eva B. Lofty
Shaw Jr. H.S.
10th & Rhode Island Ave., N.W.
D.C. 20001
673-7725

Right to Read

Mrs. Gertrude P. Morin
Shaw Jr. H.S.
10th and Rhode Island Ave., N.W.
D.C. 20001
673-7725

State Administration

Dr. Edna Mayronne
415 12th St. N.W.
Presidential Bldg.
Wash., D.C. 20004
724-4261

Board of Education

Mrs. Minnie Woodson
506 49th Pl. N.E.
D.C. 20019
398-5006

Competency Based Curriculum

Mrs. Nellie R. Lewis
Shaw Jr. High School
10th and R. I. Ave., NW
D.C. 20001
673-7726

Competency Based Curriculum

Dr.Mary White
Shaw Jr. H.S.
10th & R. I. Ave., N.W.
D.C. 20001
673-7733

Dept. of Planning & Evalution

Mrs. Veta Harrison
415 12th St. N.W.
Presidential Bldg.
D.C. 20004
724-4246

Adult Education

Mr. Vassal Marcus
415 12th St. N.W.
Presidential Bldg.
D.C. 20004
724-4212

Service for Handicapped

Mrs. Jacqueline Jackson
415 12th St. N.W.
Presidential Bldg.
D.C. 20004
629-2441

Communications

Mrs. Theora Webb
415 12th St. N.W.
Presidential Bldg.
D.C. 20004
724-4044

Washington Teachers Union

Mrs. Gloria Morris
Ludlow-Taylor School
Rt. #
724-4752

Region I - Assistant for Instruction

Mrs. Jacqueline Williams
Old Congress Heights School
Rt. #
767-7268
(Millicent Goode, Representative)

Coordinator for Open Space
Region I

Ms. Martha Frazier
Old Congress Heights School
Rt. #
767-7268

Region II Assistant for Instruction

Mrs. Florence Jackson
Jefferson Jr. H. S.
Rt. #
724-4971
(Mrs. Elizabeth Hill, Representative)

Region III Assistant for Instruction

Dr. Sheila Mandy
Nalle School
Rt. #
767-7033
(Mrs. Barbara Smith, Representative)
(Peer Assistance Teacher)

Region IV Assistant for Instruction

Mrs. Clara Rodgers
Madison Administration Bldg.
Rt. #
724-4785

Supervisor

Mrs. Almira Prem Das
Madison Administrative Bldg.
Rt. #
724-4785

Supervisor

Mrs. Lillie Parker
Madison Administrative Bldg.
Rt. # 724-4785

Title 1

Mrs. Ozeal Shyne Brown
Madison Administrative Bldg.
Rt. #

Region V Assistant for Instruction

Ms. Faustina Brown
Old Bruce School
Rt. #2
576-6335

Supervisor

Mrs. Viola Ellis
Old Bruce School
576-6334
(Mrs. Ruby Thornton, Representative)

Supervisor

Mrs. Laurice Juggins
Old Bruce School
Rt. #
576-6334

Region VI Assistant for Instruction

Mrs. Wilma Wood
Bunker Hill School
Rt. #
576-6341

Coordinator for Open Space
Region VI Education Center

Mrs. Thomasina Griffin
Bunker Hill School
Rt. #
576-6341

Supervisor

Mrs. Mary Naisbi
Bunker Hill School
Rt. #
576-6341-42

Principal

Mrs. Marjorie Burke
Shaed School
Rt. # 3
576-6052

Principal

Mrs. Frances Plummer
Merritt School
Rt. # 4
724-4618

Media

Mrs. Brenda Strong Nixon
Association for Renewal in Education
1101 15th St. N.W.
D.C. 20005
331-1707

Dr. Portia Shields
Howard University, School of Education
2400 6th St. N.W.
Wash., D.C.
636-7340

Retired Reading Specialist

Mrs. Inez Wheeler
1324 Underwood St. N.W.
WASH., D.C. 20012
882-9433